arXiv:1112.4147v1 [math.AP] 18 Dec 2011

3D VISCOUS INCOMPRESSIBLE FLUID AROUND ONE THIN OBSTACLE

C. LACAVE

Abstract. In this article, we consider Leray solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in the exterior of one obstacle in 3D and we study the asymptotic behavior of these solutions when the obstacle shrinks to a curve or to a surface. In particular, we will prove that a curve has no effect on the motion of a viscous fluid, so it is an erasable singularity for these equations.

1. Introduction

The present article studies the influence of a thin obstacle on the motion of a three-dimensional incompressible viscous flow.

Such a subject present a large literature on experiments and simulations (see the references in [7]), but concerning a PDE approach, we have waited 2006 with the first work of Iftimie, Lopes and Lopes in [6]. Therein, the authors treated the case of an obstacle which shrinks to a point in a 2D viscous fluid. They proved that we do not see the effect of the point on the motion of the flow, except if we assume a non-zero circulation for the initial velocity. Later, the present author proved in [7] that a curve in 2D is not erasable, as in the previous case. Finally, Iftimie and Kelliher showed in [5] that a point in 3D has no influence on a viscous fluid.

By our physical common sense, all these results are easy to interpret, and we could guess to prove that a surface in 3D has a non-negligible effect on a viscous fluid as the curve in 2D, and that a curve in 3D is an erasable singularity as the point in 2D for the Navier-Stokes equations. The goal of this article is exactly to show these two points. We will note that the first point can be obtained by a similar proof than [7], but the case of the curve requires a different way to cut a divergence free function.

More precisely, the motion of an incompressible viscous flow in a domain Ω is governed by the Navier-Stokes equations:

$$\partial_t u - \nu \Delta u + u \cdot \nabla u = -\nabla p, \quad \forall (t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \Omega, \tag{1.1}$$

where $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$ denotes the velocity, p the pressure and ν the viscosity. The incompressibility condition reads

$$\operatorname{div} u = 0, \quad \forall (t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \Omega. \tag{1.2}$$

The natural boundary condition is the no-slip boundary condition:

$$u = 0, \quad \forall (t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \partial\Omega. \tag{1.3}$$

As we will study the asymptotic behavior when an obstacle $\mathcal{C}_n$ shrinks to a point, a curve or a surface, we need to give an initial data which allows us to compare solutions defined on different domains. For this reason, we use an important quantity for the 2D ideal flows (ideal means that $\nu = 0$), which is the vorticity:

$$\omega := \operatorname{curl} u = (\partial_2 u_3 - \partial_3 u_2, \partial_3 u_1 - \partial_1 u_3, \partial_1 u_2 - \partial_2 u_1).$$

As in all the previous works [6, 7, 5], we fix a smooth initial vorticity ω_0, which is divergence free and compactly supported in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Let $\{\mathcal{C}_n\}$ be a family of smooth simply connected compact set of $\mathbb{R}^3$, then we claim that there exists a unique vector field u_0^n on $\Omega_n := \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{C}_n$ such that:

$$\operatorname{div} u_0^n = 0, \quad \operatorname{curl} u_0^n = \omega_0|_{\Omega_n}, \quad u_0^n \cdot \hat{n}|_{\partial\mathcal{C}_n} = 0, \quad u_0^n \in L^2(\Omega_n). \tag{1.4}$$

Date: December 20, 2011.

For such an initial velocity, it is well known that there exists a global weak solution u^n of the Navier-Stokes equations (1.1)-(1.3) on Ω_n in the Leray sense (see Definition 1.7), and *the main goal is to study the asymptotic behavior of u^n when $\mathcal{C}_n$ shrinks to a point, a curve or a surface.*

In dimension two, the exterior of one obstacle is not simply connected, and the problem (1.4) have an infinite number of solution in $L^{2,\infty}$. Indeed, we have to consider the harmonic vector field which behaves like $1/|x|$ at infinity. Then, to uniquely determine u_0^n, the authors in [6, 7] have to fix the initial circulation:

$$\gamma := \oint_{\partial\mathcal{C}_n} u_0^n \cdot \tau \, ds.$$

In the case of one obstacle $\mathcal{C}_n$ (containing the origin) which shrinks *homothetically* to 0, the main result of [6] states that u^n converges to u in $L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^2)$, where u is the solution of the Navier-Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with initial velocity u_0 verifying:

$$\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0, \quad \operatorname{curl} u_0 = \omega_0 + \gamma\delta_0,$$

where δ_0 is the Dirac at the origin. Therefore, we do not feel the presence of the point, except in the initial data. In dimension three, the exterior of one obstacle is simply connected, and the circulation has no sense, so the reader should keep in mind the previous result in the case $\gamma = 0$, i.e. a point in 2D is erasable for the Navier-Stokes equations.

When the obstacle shrinks to a Jordan curve Γ, [7] shows that the solutions u^n converges to *the unique* solution in the exterior of the curve, where the initial velocity u_0 verifies

$$\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0, \quad \operatorname{curl} u_0 = \omega_0 + g_{\omega_0}(s)\delta_\Gamma,$$

with δ_Γ the Dirac on the curve Γ and g_{ω_0} a density which can be expressed in terms of ω_0, γ and the shape of the curve. This function g_{ω_0} is continuous on Γ and blows up near the end-points of the curve. Actually, we can show that u_0 is a vector field continuous up to the curve, with different values on each sides, except near the end-points where it blows up like the inverse of the square root of the distance. Moreover, u_0 is tangent to the curve, and g_{ω_0} is equal to the jump of the velocity through the curve. Then we see an important difference with the case of the point: even if initially $\gamma = 0$, the function $g_{\omega_0} \neq 0$ which implies a non-negligible effect of the curve.

A key point in dimension two is the explicit formula for the Biot-Savart law, law giving u_0^n in terms of ω_0, γ, and the Riemann mapping T_n which sends Ω_n to the exterior of the unit disk. In [6], the authors chose an homothetic convergence in order to write: $T_n(x) = T_0(nx)$, and putting it in the Biot-Savart formula they obtained some good estimates. In [7], we assumed the convergence of T_n and T_n', and we exhibited an example of Ω_n where such a convergence holds. In that article, we were not be able to show that the convergence of the Riemann mappings holds for some"good geometrical convergence". The convergence of the biholomorphisms when the domains convergence is now established in [8].

To give the result in dimension three, we introduce the Biot-Savart law in $\mathbb{R}^3$:

$$v_0(x) = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{x-y}{4\pi|x-y|^3} \times \omega_0(y)\, dy, \tag{1.5}$$

with × denotes the standart cross product of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$, then v_0 is the unique vector field in $\mathbb{R}^3$ verifying:

$$\operatorname{div} v_0 = 0, \quad \operatorname{curl} v_0 = \omega_0, \quad v_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

With this definition, we will prove that the solution u_0^n of (1.4) appears to be the Leray projection (see later for the precise definition) of v_0:

$$u_0^n = \mathbb{P}_{\Omega_n} v_0. \tag{1.6}$$

When one obstacle $\mathcal{C}_n$ shrinks to a point in dimension three, the authors in [5] shows that u^n converges to a solution of the Navier-Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with initial velocity v_0. Therefore, a 3D viscous fluid does not feel a material point.

The goal of this article is to treat the case of a curve and a surface in dimension three.

To give a sense to a convergence of vector fields defined on different domains, we set the notation of extensions. For any function f defined on Ω_n, we denote by Ef the extension of f on $\mathbb{R}^3$, vanishing on $\mathcal{C}_n$. If f is regular enough and vanishes on $\partial\mathcal{C}_n$, then $\nabla(Ef) = E(\nabla f)$. Similarly, if v is a vector field regular enough and tangent to the boundary, then $\operatorname{div} Ev = E(\operatorname{div} v)$.

The goal of Section 2 is to show a similar result to the case of the curve in dimension two.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a simply connected compact set of $\mathbb{R}^3$, and ω_0 be a divergence free function in $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$. We consider $\{\mathcal{C}_n\}$ a family of smooth simply connected compact sets converging to $\mathcal{C}$ (in the Hausdorff sense), such that $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{C}_n$. Let u^n be a global weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations on $\Omega_n := \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{C}_n$ (in the sense of Definition 1.7) with initial velocity u_0^n ((1.6) the solution of (1.4)), then we can extract a subsequence such that Eu^n converges to u in $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \Omega)$, where u is a global weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations on $\Omega := \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{C}$ with initial velocity $u_0 = \mathbb{P}_\Omega v_0$.*

In this theorem, we do not need any assumption on the regularity of Ω. We recall that the existence of a weak solution in non smooth domain is already known in literature (see e.g. [1]).

In the case where $\mathcal{C}$ is a smooth surface, we discuss in Subsection 2.3 about some properties of the initial datum, but it is clear from the no-slip condition that the surface is a non-negligible singularity.

Section 3 is devoted to prove that the curve is an erasable singularity for the 3D Navier-Stokes equations.

Theorem 1.2. *Let Γ be a C^2 injective compact curve of $\mathbb{R}^3$, and ω_0 be a divergence free function in $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$. We consider $\{\mathcal{C}_n\}$ a family of smooth simply connected compact sets converging to Γ (in the Hausdorff sense), such that $\Gamma \subset \mathcal{C}_n$. Let u^n be a global weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations on Ω_n with initial velocity u_0^n (see (1.6)), then we can extract a subsequence such that Eu^n converges to u in $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, where u is a global weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations on $\mathbb{R}^3$ with initial velocity v_0.*

Therefore, we obtain exactly the same theorem than [5], but in the case of a curve, which is the similar result to the point in 2D (see [6]). If such a theorem seems natural, the proof requires a new way to cut divergence free test function. The method is based on the Bogovskii results.

Notation and recall.

We start by introducing the classical vector fields spaces for the study of incompressible flows.

Definition 1.3. *Let Ω an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^3$. We denote by*

- $V(\Omega) := \Big\{u \in C_0^\infty(\Omega) \mid \operatorname{div} u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega\Big\}$;
- *$\mathcal{H}(\Omega)$ the closure of $V(\Omega)$ in the norm L^2;*
- *$\mathcal{V}(\Omega)$ the closure of $V(\Omega)$ in the norm H^1, and its dual space by $\mathcal{V}'(\Omega)$;*
- $H_2(\Omega) := \Big\{u \in L^2(\Omega) \mid \operatorname{div} u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega,\ u \cdot n = 0 \text{ at } \partial\Omega\Big\}^1$;
- $\widehat{H}^1(\Omega) := \Big\{u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \mid \operatorname{div} u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega\Big\}$;
- $G(\Omega) := \Big\{w \in L^2(\Omega) \mid w = \nabla p, \text{ for some } p \in H^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)\Big\}$;

Now, we give some results on these solenoidal spaces. The following theorem concerns the Leray projection [3, Theo III.1.1].

Theorem 1.4. *Let Ω be an arbitrary domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Then $G(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\Omega)$ are orthogonal subspaces in $L^2(\Omega)$. Moreover*

$$L^2(\Omega) = G(\Omega) \oplus \mathcal{H}(\Omega).$$

Let us note that the previous theorem does not require any assumption of Ω. The validity of such a decomposition in L^q requires some restrictions, whereas for L^2, the Hilbert structure allows us to stay general. Moreover, we deduce from this theorem the existence of a unique projection operator (called Leray projection):

$$\mathbb{P}_\Omega \ :\ L^2(\Omega) \to \mathcal{H}(\Omega),$$

---

[1] $u \cdot n$ should be understood in $H^{-1/2}(\partial\Omega)$ (see e.g. [3, Theo III.2.2]).

and by orthogonality we have:

$$\|\mathbb{P}_\Omega u\|_{L^2} \leq \|u\|_{L^2}, \quad \forall u \in L^2(\Omega).$$

Let us also mention that Theorem 1.4 implies the existence-uniqueness of a solution of (1.4), and that this solution is (1.6):

Corollary 1.5. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a simply connected compact set, and $\Omega := \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{C}$. If $\omega_0 \in V(\mathbb{R}^3)$, then there exists a unique solution of*

$$\operatorname{curl} u = \omega_0|_\Omega \text{ in } \mathcal{V}'(\Omega), \quad u \in \mathcal{H}(\Omega).$$

Moreover, $u = \mathbb{P}_\Omega v_0$, where v_0 is given in terms of ω_0 by (1.5).

Proof. By Theorem 1.4, we know that $v_0|_\Omega - \mathbb{P}_\Omega v_0$ is a gradient and then $\operatorname{curl} \mathbb{P}_\Omega v_0 = \operatorname{curl} v_0|_\Omega = \omega_0|_\Omega$. Then $\mathbb{P}_\Omega v_0$ is a solution, which prove the existence part.

Concerning the uniqueness, let us assume that u and w are two solutions. As $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{C}$ is simply connected in $\mathbb{R}^3$, $\operatorname{curl}(u - w) = 0$ on Ω implies that there exists p such that $u - w = \nabla p$. Then ∇p belongs to $\mathcal{H}_\Omega$ which is possible only for $\nabla p = 0$ (see Theorem 1.4). Its ends the proof. $\square$

Actually, to infer that the previous corollary implies the existence-uniqueness of (1.4), we have to note that some spaces are similar. If $\mathcal{H}(\Omega)$ and $H_2(\Omega)$ seems to be the same (as $\mathcal{V}(\Omega)$ compared to $\widehat{H}^1(\Omega)$), we aware that there exist some counter examples, even in the case of smooth domains (see e.g. [3]). However, it will not be the case for the domains considered here. Indeed, in this article we always consider exterior domains $\Omega := \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{C}$ where $\mathcal{C}$ is a simply connected compact set. Then, [3, Rem III.3.4] implies that

$$\Omega \text{ is a locally Lipschitz domain} \Longleftrightarrow \Omega \text{ verify the cone condition.}$$

The reader can look for the precise definitions in [3], but we state that the exterior of a smooth compact or of a thin surface (as in Subsection 2.3) verifies the cone condition.

Then, Theorems III.2.3 and III.4.2 from [3] can be applied to get the following.

Theorem 1.6. *Let Ω be the complementary of one simply connected compact set. If Ω verifies the cone condition, then*

$$\mathcal{H}(\Omega) = H_2(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{V}(\Omega) = \widehat{H}^1(\Omega).$$

The exterior of the curve verifies also the cone condition, but $u \cdot n$ has no sense in this case.

Putting together Corollary 1.5 and Theorem 1.6, we finally get, in the case of smooth simply connected compact obstacle $\mathcal{C}_n$, the existence-uniqueness of a solution of (1.4), and that this solution is (1.6).

Now we give precise definition of a global weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations in the Leray sense.

Definition 1.7. *Let $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}(\Omega)$. We say that u is a global weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations on Ω with initial velocity u_0 iff*

- *u belongs to*

$$C([0,\infty); \mathcal{V}'(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty_{\text{loc}}([0,\infty); \mathcal{H}(\Omega)) \cap L^2_{\text{loc}}([0,\infty); \mathcal{V}(\Omega));$$

- *u verifies the momentum equation in the sense of $\mathcal{V}'(\Omega)$, i.e. $\forall \psi \in C^1([0,\infty); \mathcal{V}(\Omega))$, we have for all t:*

$$\int_\Omega (u \cdot \psi)(t,x)\,dx + \int_0^t \int_\Omega (-u \cdot \psi_t + \nu \nabla u : \nabla \psi - (u \otimes u) : \nabla \psi)(t',x)\,dx\,dt' = \int_\Omega u_0 \cdot \psi(0,\cdot); \tag{1.7}$$

- *u verifies the energy inequality:*

$$\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + 2\nu \int_0^t \|\nabla u(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|u_0\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{1.8}$$

Without any assumption about the regularity of Ω, the Leray theorem states that there exists a global weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations in the sense of the previous definition (see e.g. [1, Theo 2.3] and [9, Theo III.3.1]). So the goal here is to choose one solution u^n on Ω_n and to prove that the limit of u^n is a weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations on Ω or on $\mathbb{R}^3$.

2. Convergence of viscous flows when the obstacles converge to a singular compact

2.1. **Convergence of the initial velocity.**

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a simply connected compact set. We consider $\{\mathcal{C}_n\}$ a family of compact, simply connected, smooth set of $\mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{C}_n$ and $\mathcal{C}_n$ converges to $\mathcal{C}$ in the Hausdorff topology when $n \to \infty$.

The only property needed here concerning Hausdorff topology is the following.

Proposition 2.1. *If $(\mathcal{C}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges in the Hausdorff sense to $\mathcal{C}$ and K is a compact subset of $\Omega := \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{C}$, then there exists n_0 such that $\Omega_n := \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \mathcal{C}_n \supset K$ for all $n \geq n_0$.*

As mentioned in the introduction, we fix $\omega_0 \in V(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and we define u_0^n as in (1.6), which is the unique vector field verifying (1.4). Let us show that u_0^n converges strongly to $u_0 := \mathbb{P}_\Omega v_0$. We recall that E is the extension by zero in $\mathcal{C}_n$.

Proposition 2.2. *With the above notations, we have that*

$$Eu_0^n \to u_0 \text{ strongly in } L^2(\Omega).$$

Proof. As the Leray projection is orthogonal in L^2, we get from (1.6) that

$$\|Eu_0^n\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = \|u_0^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_n)} \leq \|v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_n)} \leq \|v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

By the Banach-Alaoglu's theorem, we infer that there exists $w_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and a subsequence $n \to \infty$, such that

$$Eu_0^n \rightharpoonup w_0 \text{ weak in } L^2(\Omega).$$

This weak convergence implies in particular that

$$\|w_0\|_{L^2} \leq \liminf \|Eu_0^n\|_{L^2},$$

and

$$\operatorname{curl} w_0 = \omega_0|_\Omega \text{ in } \mathcal{V}'(\Omega).$$

In the proof of Corollary 1.5 we prove that $\operatorname{curl} \mathbb{P}_{\Omega_n} w_0 = \operatorname{curl} w_0|_{\Omega_n} = \omega_0|_{\Omega_n}$. Then, Corollary 1.5 implies that $u_0^n = \mathbb{P}_{\Omega_n} w_0$ and then

$$\|Eu_0^n\|_{L^2} \leq \|w_0\|_{L^2}.$$

Putting together the two last inequalities, we get $\|Eu_0^n\|_{L^2} \to \|w_0\|_{L^2}$. Using the weak convergence in $L^2(\Omega)$ of Eu_0^n to w_0 we obtain the strong convergence in $L^2(\Omega)$.

As Eu_0^n belongs to $\mathcal{H}(\Omega_n)$, we deduce directly from the L^2 strong convergence that w_0 belongs to $\mathcal{H}(\Omega)$. Then we have two functions in $\mathcal{H}(\Omega)$ having the same vorticity, which implies that $u_0 = w_0$ (see Corollary 1.5).

□

Remark 2.3. We have obtained in the previous proof that

$$\operatorname{curl} u_0 = \omega_0 = \operatorname{curl} v_0 \text{ in } \mathcal{V}'(\Omega)$$

but we do not have

$$\operatorname{curl} u_0 = \omega_0 = \operatorname{curl} v_0 \text{ in } H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Even in the case where S is a thin surface, we can just pretend that $\operatorname{curl}(u_0 - v_0)$ belongs to $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and supported on the surface. Actually, we will prove in Subsection 2.3 that

$$\operatorname{curl} u_0 = \omega_0 + g_S \delta_S$$

where g_S is the jump of the tangential component of u_0.

In the case of the curve, we will show in Subsection 3.1 that there is no function belonging in $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ compactly supported on a curve, and we will obtain that $u_0 = v_0$.

2.2. Time evolution.

For all n, we denote by u^n a global weak solution of the Navier-Stokes equations (in the sense of Definition 1.7) on Ω_n with initial data u_0^n.

By Proposition 2.2, we already know that $Eu_0^n \to u_0$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. Moreover, thanks to the energy inequality (1.8), we state that

$$Eu^n \text{ is uniformly bounded in } L^\infty((0,\infty);\mathcal{H}_\Omega) \text{ and } \nabla Eu^n \text{ is uniformly bounded in } L^2((0,\infty)\times\Omega). \tag{2.1}$$

Now, we need to establish a temporal estimates. First, we use that u^n verifies the Dirichlet boundary condition for $t>0$ in order to write the following Sobolev inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}\|u^n\|_{L^4(\Omega_n)} &= \|Eu^n\|_{L^4(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \|Eu^n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{1/4}\|Eu^n\|_{L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{3/4}\\ &\leq C\|Eu^n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{1/4}\|\nabla(Eu^n)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{3/4} = C\|u^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_n)}^{1/4}\|\nabla u^n\|_{L^2(\Omega_n)}^{3/4},\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where C is independent of n. We consider in a first step O an open bounded set relatively compact in Ω. By Proposition 2.1, there exists n_O such that $O\cap\mathcal{C}_n=\emptyset$ for all $n\geq n_O$, then we have for any $\Phi\in V(O)$ and $n\geq n_O$:

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle u^n(t),\Phi\rangle - \langle u^n(s),\Phi\rangle| &= \Big|\int_s^t\int_{\Omega_n} -\nu\nabla u^n:\nabla\Phi + (u^n\otimes u^n):\nabla\Phi\Big|\\ &\leq \nu(t-s)^{1/2}\|\nabla u^n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+\times\Omega_n)}\|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2}\\ &\quad +(t-s)^{1/4}\|u^n\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+,L^2(\Omega_n))}^{1/2}\|\nabla u^n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^+\times\Omega_n)}^{3/2}\|\nabla\Phi\|_{L^2}\\ &\leq C((t-s)^{1/2}+(t-s)^{1/4})\|\Phi\|_{H^1},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (2.2). This inequality implies that $\{Eu^n\}$ is equicontinous as a family of functions from $\mathbb{R}^+$ to $\mathcal{V}'(O)$. Using that this family is bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;L^2(O))$, Ascoli theorem gives that $\{Eu^n\}$ is precompact in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+;H^{-2}(O))$. Moreover, $\{Eu^n\}$ is also bounded in $L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+;H^1(O))$, then we get by interpolation that this family is precompact in $L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+\times O)$. Finally, by a diagonal extraction on the compact sets of Ω, we conclude that

$$\{Eu^n\} \text{ is precompact in } L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+\times\Omega).$$

Therefore, there exists a subsequence $n\to\infty$ such that $Eu^n\to u$ strongly in $L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+\times\Omega)$. Moreover, extracting a subsequence if necessary, we know from (2.1) that

$$u\in L^\infty((0,\infty);\mathcal{H}(\Omega)) \text{ and } \nabla u\in L^2((0,\infty)\times\Omega). \tag{2.3}$$

For any test function $\psi\in C^1(\mathbb{R}^+;\mathcal{V}(\Omega))$, there exist $\psi^k\in C_c^\infty((0,\infty)\times\Omega)$, $\operatorname{div}\psi^k=0$ such that[2]

$$\psi^k\to\psi \text{ strongly in } L^q_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+;\mathcal{V}(\Omega)),\quad \forall q\in(1,\infty).$$

For k fixed, there exists n_k such that $\operatorname{supp}\psi^k\cap\mathcal{C}_n=\emptyset$, $\forall n\geq n_k$, then (1.7) reads

$$\int_0^\infty\int_\Omega(-u^n\cdot\psi^k_t+\nu\nabla u^n:\nabla\psi^k-(u^n\otimes u^n):\nabla\psi^k)\,dx\,dt'=0.$$

Thanks to the strong convergence of u^n in $L^2_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+\times\Omega)$ and the weak of ∇u^n in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^+\times\Omega)$ then we can pass to the limit $n\to\infty$ to get:

$$\int_0^\infty\int_\Omega(-u\cdot\psi^k_t+\nu\nabla u:\nabla\psi^k-(u\otimes u):\nabla\psi^k)\,dx\,dt'=0.$$

In particular, this equality putting together with (2.3) and (2.2) gives that

$$\partial_t u \text{ belongs to } L^{4/3}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+,\mathcal{V}'(\Omega)).$$

Then we can pass to the limit in

$$\int_0^\infty\int_\Omega(\partial_t u\cdot\psi^k+\nu\nabla u:\nabla\psi^k-(u\otimes u):\nabla\psi^k)\,dx\,dt'=0 \tag{2.4}$$

---

[2] see e.g. [7, Prop 3.6].

as $k\to\infty$ to get

$$\forall\varphi\in C_c^\infty(0,\infty),\qquad \int_0^\infty\int_\Omega(\partial_t u\cdot\psi\varphi+\nu\varphi\nabla u:\nabla\psi-\varphi(u\otimes u):\nabla\psi)\,dx\,dt'=0.$$

This equality implies that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega u\cdot\psi=\int_\Omega(u\cdot\psi_t-\nu\nabla u:\nabla\psi+(u\otimes u):\nabla\psi)\,dx \tag{2.5}$$

in the sense of distribution in $\mathbb{R}^+$. Since the right hand side term belongs to $L^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+)$, the equality holds in $L^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+)$.

Now, we check that u belongs in the good functional space. Thanks to the previous equality, and (2.3), then we can easily prove that

$$u\in C([0,\infty);\mathcal{V}'(\Omega))\cap C_w([0,\infty);\mathcal{H}(\Omega)).$$

This argument can be found in [9, Subsection III.3.1]: as $\partial_t u$ belongs to $L^1(\mathcal{V}')$, then its implies that u is almost everywhere equal to a function continuous from $\mathbb{R}^+$ into $\mathcal{V}'$. Moreover, using the fact that $u\in L^\infty(\mathcal{H})$, then [9, Lem 1.4] states that the continuity in $\mathcal{V}'$ implies the weak continuity in time with values in $\mathcal{H}$.

Moreover, thanks to the continuity in $\mathcal{V}'$, we infer that the equality (2.5) in the sense of $L^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ implies that the integral equality (1.7) holds for all $t>0$. Indeed, for the initial data we know from the uniform convergence in $H^{-2}_{\rm loc}(\Omega)$ that $Eu_0^n\to u|_{t=0}$ in $H^{-2}_{\rm loc}(\Omega)$. However, we proved in Proposition 2.2 that $Eu_0^n\to u_0$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, which allows us to state by the uniqueness of the limit in $H^{-2}_{\rm loc}$ that the initial velocity is $u_0=\mathbb{P}_\Omega v_0$.

To finish the proof of Theorem 1.1, we have to prove the energy inequality. We take the liminf of (1.8):

$$\liminf_{n\to 0}\|Eu^n(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}+2\nu\liminf_{n\to 0}\int_0^t\|\nabla Eu^n(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\leq\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

and we note that the weak limit[3] in L^2 of $Eu^n(t)$ to $u(t)$ and the weak limit in $L^2((0,t)\times\Omega)$ of ∇Eu^n to ∇u imply that

$$\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\leq\liminf_{n\to 0}\|Eu^n(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\text{ and }\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2((0,t)\times\Omega)}\leq\liminf_{n\to 0}\|\nabla Eu^n\|^2_{L^2((0,t)\times\Omega)}.$$

It gives the last point required in Definition 1.7, which ends the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Therefore, we have shown that the Navier-Stokes solutions converge when domains convergence to the exterior of a simply connected compact set $\mathcal{C}$. We note here that we do not assume any assumption on the regularity of $\mathcal{C}$. In particular, this result holds if $\mathcal{C}$ is a surface S. As $u(t,\cdot)\in\mathcal{V}(\Omega)$ for a.e. time, it is clear that the surface has a non-negligible effect on the motion of 3D viscous flow: u verifies for almost every time the no slip boundary condition. In the following subsection, we discuss about the initial velocity properties in the particular case of the surface, and the goal is to get some similarities to the curve in 2D.

2.3. **Remark on the behavior of the initial velocity near a smooth surface.**

In the two dimensional case, we obtain in [7] an explicit formula of the initial velocity in terms of the biholomorphisms. This formula allows us to state that u_0 is continuous up to the curve with different values on each side, except near the end-points where it behaves as the inverse of the square root of the distance. In our case, we do not have this formula, and we use in this subsection classical elliptic theory in order to get similar results in the case where S is a bounded orientable surface of codimension 1 in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

---

[3] Indeed, by the uniform estimates and diagonal extraction, we can find a common subsequence such that $Eu^n(t)$ weakly converge for all $t\in\mathbb{Q}^+$. Then, we conclude by the continuity that this sequence holds for all $t\in\mathbb{R}^+$.

As mentioned in Remark 2.3, $u_0 - v_0$ is curl free in Ω and as Ω is simply connected we infer that there exists p such that $u_0 - v_0 = \nabla p$. We know that v_0 is continuous up to the boundary, then the goal is to determine the behavior of ∇p near S where p verifies the following elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} \Delta p = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ \dfrac{\partial p}{\partial n} = -v_0 \cdot n & \text{on } S, \end{cases}$$

where v_0 is regular on S.

This subsection is independent of the convergence theory, and the goal here is just to give an example of behavior of u_0. Therefore, we add here some conditions on S in order to apply classical elliptic results. We assume that S is a C^∞ manifold and its boundary $\mathcal{B}$ is a C^∞ closed curve.

The study of elliptic equations in the exterior of a surface with the Neumann condition is standard for the crack problem in 3D linear elasticity. Actually, to get exactly the Neumann boundary condition, we add a regular function h such that $\tilde{p} := p + h$ verifies

$$\Delta \tilde{p} = f \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{p}}{\partial n} = 0 \text{ on } S.$$

For ω_0 regular enough, we rich the necessary regularity for f in order to state that $\tilde{p}$ have an expansion near $\mathcal{B}$ on the form

$$\sum_{k\geq 0} r^{\frac{1}{2}+k} \psi(\theta)$$

in local polar coordinates (r, θ). Such a result is proved in [2] (see also the references therein). In particular, it implies that u_0 is continuous up to S, with possibly different values on each side, except near the boundary $\mathcal{B}$ where u_0 behaves like the inverse of the square root of the distance. Therefore, we obtain exactly the same behavior in 3D in the exterior of a surface than in 2D in the exterior of a curve.

Thanks to the continuity up to the surface, it is easy to see that the tangent condition implies that

$$\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0 \text{ and } \operatorname{curl} u_0 = \omega_0 + g\delta_S$$

in $\mathcal{V}'(\mathbb{R}^3)$, where g is the jump of the tangential component of u_0 through the surface.

3. Viscous flow around a curve

As in the previous section and as in [5], we consider $\mathcal{C}_n$ a family of compact, simply connected, smooth set of $\mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\mathcal{C}_n$ converges to Γ in the Hausdorff topology when $n \to \infty$. Here, Γ is assumed to be a compact injective C^2 curve, i.e. of dimension 1 in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The goal of this section is to prove that the curve is a negligible singularity for the Naviers-Stokes solutions in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

3.1. **Convergence of the initial velocity.**

In the following subsections, we will need to use a suitable cutoff function of a small neighborhood of Γ. Let χ be a function verifying

$$\chi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}), \quad \chi(s) \equiv 0 \text{ on } (-\infty, 1), \quad \chi(s) \equiv 1 \text{ on } (2, +\infty),$$

then we define

$$\eta_n(x) := \chi\Big(n\mathrm{d}(x, \Gamma)\Big). \tag{3.1}$$

Although it is obvious that η_n vanishes in a small neighborhood of Γ, we need the following estimates of $\|\nabla \eta_n\|_{L^p}$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let Γ be a C^2 compact injective curve. There exist n_0 and $C > 0$ such that for all $n > n_0$,*

$$\|\nabla \eta_n\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq Cn \textit{ and } \operatorname{mes}\Big(\operatorname{supp}\ (1 - \eta_n)\Big) \leq C/n^2,$$

where mes *is the Lebesgue measure.*

Even if such a proposition seems standard, we write the details in Appendix A for a sake of completeness. Thanks to this proposition, we can prove that there is no function supported on Γ which belongs to $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let f a function belonging in $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. If*

$$\langle f,\varphi\rangle_{H^{-1},H^1}=0,\ \forall\varphi\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Gamma)$$

then $f=0$ in $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Proof. We fix $\varphi\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, and we introduce

$$\varphi_n(x):=\eta_n(x)\varphi(x)$$

where η_n is the cutoff function defined in (3.1). As we proved in Appendix A that η_n is C^1 supported in the exterior of a small neighborhood of Γ, then by assumption (and density of $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Gamma)$ in $C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Gamma)$ for $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ norm), we have that

$$\langle f,\varphi_n\rangle_{H^{-1},H^1}=0,\ \forall n.$$

Thanks to Proposition 3.1, we get easily that

$$\|\varphi_n-\varphi\|_{L^2}\leq C(\varphi)/n\to 0 \text{ and } \|\nabla\varphi_n-\nabla\varphi\|_{L^2}\leq C(\varphi).$$

By Banach-Alaoglu theorem, we can extract a subsequence such that $\varphi_n-\varphi\rightharpoonup 0$ weakly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. In particular, it implies that

$$\langle f,\varphi\rangle=\langle f,\varphi_n\rangle+\langle f,\varphi-\varphi_n\rangle=\langle f,\varphi-\varphi_n\rangle\to 0$$

as $n\to\infty$. Then, we have proved that for all $\varphi\in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, we have $\langle f,\varphi\rangle=0$. □

Now, we can come back to our main problem. Let Γ be an injective compact smooth curve in $\mathbb{R}^3$. We consider $\mathcal{C}_n$ a family of compact, simply connected, smooth set of $\mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\mathcal{C}_n$ converges to Γ in the Hausdorff topology when $n\to\infty$. Let ω_0 an initial vorticity which is bounded and compactly supported in $\mathbb{R}^3$. As in the previous section we set

$$\omega_0^n:=\omega_0|_{\Omega_n} \text{ with } \Omega_n:=\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\mathcal{C}_n$$

then we define by $u_0^n:=\mathbb{P}_{\Omega_n}v_0$ the unique vector field in Ω_n solving (1.4). We prove in the following proposition that we do not feel the presence of the curve for the limit initial velocity.

Proposition 3.3. *With the above notation, we have*

$$Eu_0^n\to v_0 \text{ strongly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

where v_0 is the velocity field without obstacle (1.5)*.*

Proof. As v_0 is continuous and behaves like $\mathcal{O}(1/|x|^2)$ at infinity, we obtain directly that v_0 belongs to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for any $p\in(3/2,\infty]$.

Firstly, we introduce the stream function corresponding to v_0:

$$\psi(x)=-\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{x-y}{4\pi|x-y|^3}\times v_0(y)\,dy,$$

which verifies $\operatorname{curl}\psi=v_0$, $\operatorname{div}\psi=0$ and $\|\psi\|_{L^\infty}\leq C\|v_0\|_{L^2\cap L^4}$ (see e.g. [5]), so ψ is bounded.

Secondly, we define

$$w^n:=\operatorname{curl}(\eta_n\psi)=\eta_n v_0+\nabla\eta_n\times\psi,$$

where η_n is the cutoff function (3.1). By construction, we deduce that w^n belongs to $H_2(\Omega_n)=\mathcal{H}(\Omega_n)$.

Finally, we use that u_0^n is the L^2 projection of $v_0|_{\Omega_n}$ on $\mathcal{H}(\Omega_n)$, to compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Eu_0^n-v_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} &\leq \|u_0^n-v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_n)}+\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{C}_n)}\\
&\leq \|w^n-v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_n)}+\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{C}_n)}\\
&\leq \|\nabla\eta_n\times\psi\|_{L^2(\Omega_n)}+\|(1-\eta_n)v_0\|_{L^2(\Omega_n)}+\|v_0\|_{L^2(\mathcal{C}_n)}\\
&\leq \|\nabla\eta_n\|_{L^2}\|\psi\|_{L^\infty}+\|v_0\|_{L^\infty}(1/n+\operatorname{mes}(\mathcal{C}_n))\\
&\leq C,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Proposition 3.1. This inequality allows us to pretend that there exist $v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and a subsequence such that
$$Eu_0^n - v_0 \rightharpoonup v \text{ weakly in } L^2.$$
By passing to the limit, we obtain that $\operatorname{div} v = \operatorname{curl} v = 0$ for all test function in $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Gamma)$. Moreover, $\operatorname{div} v$ and $\operatorname{curl} v$ belongs to $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and we apply the previous lemma to state that $\operatorname{div} v = \operatorname{curl} v \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^3$, and then $v = 0$.

Moreover, reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 2.2, we pass from the weak convergence to the strong convergence of u_0^n to v_0, which ends this proof. ☐

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.**

The begin of the proof follows the same idea of the proof of Theorem 1.1: we prove that we have a strong limit of Eu^n to u a solution of the Navier-Stokes equations in "the exterior of the curve". The second step is to show that u is actually a solution in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

For all n, we consider u^n a global weak solution, in the sense of Definition 1.7, of (1.1)-(1.3) in Ω_n with initial datum u_0^n, which is defined in the previous subsection.

By Proposition 3.3, we already know that $Eu_0^n \to v_0$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Next, we do exactly the same thing than in Subsection 2.2:

- uniform estimates of Eu^n in $L^\infty((0,\infty); L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and of ∇Eu^n in $L^2((0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^3)$;
- equicontinuity in $\mathcal{V}^{-1}(O)$, with O relatively compact in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Gamma$;
- precompactness of $\{Eu^n\}$ in $L^2_{\text{loc}}\Big(\mathbb{R}^+ \times (\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Gamma)\Big)$;
- by a priori estimates we know that
$$u \in L^\infty((0,\infty); L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \text{ and } \nabla u \in L^2((0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^3);$$
- passing at the limit $n \to \infty$ in the weak formulation of the momentum equation: $\forall \psi^k \in C_0^\infty((0,\infty)\times(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Gamma)) \,|\, \operatorname{div} \psi^k = 0$, we have (2.4).

Now, we need to prove that the momentum equation is verified for all $\psi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^+; \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Then, to finish the proof of Theorem 1.2, we have to establish (1.7) for test functions which meet the curve. The following lemma will be the key of this extension.

Lemma 3.4. *For all* $\varphi \in C_c^\infty((0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^3)$ *such that* $\operatorname{div}\varphi = 0$*, then there exists a sequence* $\psi_n \in C_c^\infty((0,\infty)\times(\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\Gamma))$ *such that*
$$\operatorname{div}\psi_n = 0 \textit{ and } \psi_n \rightharpoonup \varphi \textit{ weak-}* \textit{ in } L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

Proof. All the difficulty comes from the condition $\operatorname{div}\psi_n = 0$. Indeed, without this condition, it is sufficient to multiply by the cutoff function. In [6, 7, 5], the standard way to construct divergence free functions compactly supported outside the obstacle is to multiply the stream function by the cutoff function. However, we see in the proof of Proposition 3.3 that the computation of the H^1 norm makes appear $\|\nabla^2 \eta_n\|_{L^2}$ which blows up strongly in our case.

So, we present here a new way to approximate divergence free function, which is not explicit as in the standard way. The following method comes from [3, Chap III.4] and is based on the Bogovskii operator. We set
$$f_n(t,x) := \eta_n(x)\varphi(t,x)$$
which belongs to $C_c^\infty((0,\infty); C_c^1(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Gamma))$ but which is not divergence free. Its divergence
$$g_n(t,x) := \operatorname{div}(\eta_n(x)\varphi(t,x)) = \varphi(t,x)\cdot\nabla\eta_n(x)$$
verifies the following estimates for all t:
$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} g_n(t,\cdot) = 0 \text{ and} \|g_n(t,\cdot)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq Cn^{1-\frac{2}{p}},$$
where C depends only on φ. To correct this divergence, we use the result of Bogovskii. Let B be a ball big enough containing the support of φ. As the set $\Omega := B \setminus \Gamma$ verifies the cone condition, and as

$g_n \in L^p(\Omega)$ with $\int_\Omega g_n = 0$, then Theorem 3.1 in [3, Chap III.3] states that there exists at least one solution h_n of the following problem:

$$\operatorname{div} h_n = -g_n, \quad h_n \in W^{1,p}_0(\Omega), \quad \|h_n\|_{W^{1,p}} \leq c_p \|g_n\|_{L^p}.$$

Moreover, the constant c_p depends only on Ω and p, and as g_n as a compact support in Ω, so is h_n. Then, we can define for all t, $g_n(t,\cdot)$, and we have that $h_n \to 0$ strongly in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ for all $p < 2$ and uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$. So we can extract a subsequence such that h_n converges weak-$*$ in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and by uniqueness of the limit in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; W^{1,p}(B))$ it converges to 0.

From the definition we get that $f_n - \varphi$ converges to 0 strongly in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; W^{1,p}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ for any $p < 2$ and weak-$*$ in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$.

In conclusion, $\psi_n := f_n + h_n$ is divergence free, compactly supported in $B \setminus \Gamma$ and converges to φ weak-$*$ in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Smoothing ψ_n by some mollifiers, we obtain the result. ☐

In the previous proof, we see that the approximation constructed verifies also

$$\partial_t \psi_n \rightharpoonup \partial_t \varphi \text{ weak-}* \text{ in } L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)).$$

Therefore, we apply the previous lemma in order to pass to the limit in (2.4), which implies that this equality is verified for all test function in $C^\infty_c((0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^3)$. Now, we finish as we did in Subsection 2.2:

- (2.4) gives that $\partial_t u \in L^{4/3}_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+; \mathcal{V}'(\mathbb{R}^3))$;
- we pass at the limit to say that the momentum equation is verified for all $\psi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^+; \mathcal{V}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$;
- we get the continuity in time with values in $\mathcal{V}'(\mathbb{R}^3)$;
- we conclude to the validity of (1.7) for all t;
- identification of the initial velocity: $u(0,\cdot) = v_0$ by Proposition 3.3;
- thanks to weak convergence, we prove the energy inequality (1.8) on $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Its ends to prove that u is a global weak solution of the Navier-Stokes solutions in $\mathbb{R}^3$, in the sense of Definition 1.7.

We finish the proof of Theorem 1.2 by noting that the uniform estimates (2.1) and the convergence in $L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times (\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Gamma))$ implies that

$$Eu^n \to u \text{ strongly in } L^2_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^3).$$

Indeed, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and K a compact of $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^3$, we decompose the L^2 norm thanks to (2.2):

$$\begin{aligned} \|Eu^n - u\|_{L^2(K)} &\leq \|\eta_k(Eu^n - u)\|_{L^2(K)} + \|(1-\eta_k)(Eu^n - u)\|_{L^2(K)} \\ &\leq \|Eu^n - u\|_{L^2(K \cap \operatorname{supp} \eta_k)} + \|(1-\eta_k)\|_{L^4} \|Eu^n - u\|^{1/4}_{L^\infty(L^2)} \|Eu^n - u\|^{3/4}_{L^2(0,T;H^1)} T^{1/8}, \end{aligned}$$

where T is a time bigger than all $t \in K$. Using the uniform estimates, we deduce from Proposition 3.1 that the second right hand side term tends to zero as $k \to \infty$, uniformly in n. So there exists k_ε such that this term is less than $\varepsilon/2$. For this k_ε fixed, the first right hand side term tends to zero as $n \to \infty$ because the compact does not meet Γ. Then, there exists N_ε such that this term is less than $\varepsilon/2$ for any $n \geq N_\varepsilon$, which ends the proof.

Appendix A. Cutoff functions

In order to differentiate the function $x \mapsto \mathrm{d}(x, \Gamma)$, we have to check that the minimal distance $\mathrm{d}(x,y)$ is reached for a unique $y \in \Gamma$, at least for x closed enough to Γ. We need to assume that the curve is at least C^1, because such a property is false near a corner. For example, if Γ is the curve $\{(x,y,0) | x \in [-1,1], y = |x|\}$ then for all M on the half line $\{(0,y,0) | y > 0\}$, we have two minimums on Γ: $M_1 := (-y/\sqrt{2}, y/\sqrt{2}, 0)$ and $M_2 := (y/\sqrt{2}, y/\sqrt{2}, 0)$ and $\mathrm{d}(M,\Gamma) = \mathrm{d}(M,M_1) = \mathrm{d}(M,M_2) = y/\sqrt{2}$.

This example shows that we have to assume some regularity for the curve.

Lemma A.1. *Let* Γ *be a* C^2 *injective curve, then there exists* $\tilde{n}_0$ *such that*

$$\forall x \mid \mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma) < 1/\tilde{n}_0,\ \exists! y \in \Gamma \mid \mathrm{d}(x,y) = \mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma).$$

Proof. Let $s \mapsto \Gamma(s) = M$ be the arclength parametrization. Then, we recall the standard definition:

- the tangent vector and the curvature

$$\vec{\tau}(s) = \frac{\mathrm{d}M}{\mathrm{d}s} = \Gamma'(s), \quad \rho(s) = \Big\| \frac{\mathrm{d}\vec{\tau}(s)}{\mathrm{d}s} \Big\| = \|\Gamma''(s)\|;$$

- the main normal vector and the binormal vector (if $\rho(s) \neq 0$)

$$\vec{\nu}(s) = \frac{1}{\rho(s)} \frac{\mathrm{d}\vec{\tau}(s)}{\mathrm{d}s} = \frac{\Gamma''(s)}{\|\Gamma''(s)\|}, \quad \vec{\beta}(s) = \vec{\tau}(s) \times \vec{\nu}(s).$$

As Γ is assumed to be C^2, there exists $\rho_M > 0$ such that $|\rho(s)| \leq \rho_M$ on Γ.

The existence of $y \in \Gamma$ such that $\mathrm{d}(x,y) = \mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma)$ is obvious because the map $z \mapsto \mathrm{d}(x,z)$ is continuous on the compact Γ. Let us assume that the conclusion of the lemma is false, i.e. that the infimum is reached twice:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N},\ \exists x_n \mid \mathrm{d}(x_n,\Gamma) < 1/n,\ \exists y_n = \Gamma(s_{1,n}), z_n = \Gamma(s_{2,n})$$

such that

$$s_{1,n} < s_{2,n} \text{ and } \mathrm{d}(x_n,y_n) = \mathrm{d}(x_n,\Gamma) = \mathrm{d}(x_n,z_n).$$

Extracting a subsequence, we have by compactness that $x_n, y_n, z_n \to x \in \Gamma$. As the curve is assumed to be injective (so without cross-point), we infer that $s_{1,n} - s_{2,n} \to 0$. So, by continuity of Γ in x, we note easily that there exists N such that

$$\mathrm{d}(x_N, \Gamma(s)) \leq 1/(2\rho_M),\ \forall s \in [s_{1,N}, s_{2,N}]. \tag{A.1}$$

Next, we introduce the following function

$$f:\ s \mapsto \mathrm{d}(x_N,\Gamma(s))^2 = \|\overrightarrow{x_N M(s)}\|^2,$$

and we differentiate twice to get

$$f'(s) = 2\overrightarrow{x_N M(s)} \cdot \vec{\tau}(s), \quad f''(s) = 2\Big(1 + \rho(s)\overrightarrow{x_N M(s)} \cdot \vec{\nu}(s)\Big).$$

The previous computation holds even if $\rho(s) = 0$.

By assumption, f is minimal for $s_{1,N}$ and $s_{2,N}$, so

$$f'(s_{1,N}) = 0 = f'(s_{2,N}),$$

but (A.1) implies that

$$f''(s) \geq 1,\ \forall s \in [s_{1,N}, s_{2,N}]$$

which is impossible. This contradiction allows us to end this proof. □

Remark A.2. In the previous proof, we infer from $f'(s_{1,N}) = 0$ that $\overrightarrow{x_N M(s_{1,N})} \cdot \vec{\tau}(s_{1,N}) = 0$ when $M(s_{1,N})$ is the closest point of Γ to x_N.

Now, we link the differentiability of $g\ :\ x \mapsto \mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma)$ and the previous lemma.

Lemma A.3. *Let* Γ *be a* C^2 *injective curve and* $\tilde{n}_0$ *from Lemma A.1. Then for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Gamma$ *such that* $\mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma) < 1/\tilde{n}_0$*,* g *is differentiable in* x *and*

$$\nabla g(x) = \frac{x-y}{\|x-y\|},$$

where y *is the unique point of* Γ *such that* $\|x-y\| = \mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma)$*.*

Proof. This proof can be found in the exercise book [4] and we copy it for a sake of completeness. We fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Gamma$ such that $\mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma) < 1/\tilde{n}_0$, then Lemma A.1 states that there exists a unique $y \in \Gamma$ verifying $\|x-y\| = \mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma)$.

The first step consists to show the following property: for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^3$ small enough, we set y_h by the unique point of Γ such that $\|x+h-y_h\| = \mathrm{d}(x+h,\Gamma)$, then

$$\|y_h - y\| \to 0 \text{ as } h \to 0. \tag{A.2}$$

Let us assume that (A.2) is false, then there exist a sequence $h_n \to 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $\|y_{h_n} - y\| \geq \delta$ for all n. We introduce the following compact set

$$G := \{z \in \Gamma \mid \|z-y\| \geq \delta\}$$

and the function

$$h \,:\, z \in G \mapsto \|x-z\|^2.$$

This function is continuous and reaches his minimum. As $y \notin G$, the uniqueness part of Lemma A.1 allows us to check that this minimum is strictly greater than $\|x-y\|^2$. Hence, we have

$$\mathrm{d}(x,G) > \mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma).$$

However, we use the fact that y_{h_n} belongs to G to write

$$g(x+h_n) = \mathrm{d}(x+h_n,\Gamma) = \|x+h_n-y_{h_n}\| = \mathrm{d}(x+h_n,G)$$

implying that

$$g(x+h_n) \to \mathrm{d}(x,G) > g(x)$$

which is impossible by the continuity of g. The property (A.2) follows from this contradiction.

Let us prove in the second step that (A.2) implies that g is differentiable. On the one hand, we have that

$$g^2(x+h) \leq \|x+h-y\|^2 = g^2(x) + 2(x-y)\cdot h + \|h\|^2. \tag{A.3}$$

On the other hand, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} g^2(x+h) = \|x+h-y_h\|^2 &= \|x-y_h\|^2 + 2(x-y_h)\cdot h + \|h\|^2 \\ &\geq \|x-y\|^2 + 2(x-y)\cdot h + 2(y-y_h)\cdot h + \|h\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (A.2) implies that

$$g^2(x+h) \geq g^2(x) + 2(x-y)\cdot h + o(h). \tag{A.4}$$

Putting together (A.4)-(A.3), we conclude that g^2 is differentiable and that

$$\nabla(g^2(x)) = 2g(x)\nabla g(x) = 2(x-y)$$

which ends the proof. □

From the value of ∇g, we see that the uniqueness part of Lemma A.1 is mandatory to obtain the differentiability of g (or of g^2).

Finally, we can establish the estimates of the cutoff function by proving Proposition 3.1.

Thanks to the definition and Lemma A.3, we compute for $n > 2\tilde{n}_0$

$$\nabla\eta_n(x) = n\chi'\Big(n\mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma)\Big)\nabla\mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma) = n\chi'\Big(n\mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma)\Big)\frac{x-y}{\|x-y\|},$$

where y is the unique point of Γ such that $\|x-y\| = \mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma)$. Indeed, $\chi'\Big(n\mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma)\Big) \neq 0$ iff $1/n \leq \mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma) \leq 2/n$, so $x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Gamma$ and $\mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma) < 1/\tilde{n}_0$ which allows us to apply the previous lemmas.

Hence, we obtain directly the first point:

$$\|\nabla\eta_n\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq n\|\chi'\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}.$$

Concerning the support, we use Remark A.2 to note that for all $x \in \operatorname{supp}(1-\eta_n)$, then the unique $y \in \Gamma$ such that $\mathrm{d}(x,y) = \mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma)$ verifies $\overrightarrow{xy}\cdot\overrightarrow{\tau} = 0$. If there is an interval where $\rho(s) = 0$, then it implies that Γ on this part is a segment. Then, it is obvious that the volume such that $\mathrm{d}(x,\Gamma) \leq 2/n$ is

$\mathcal{O}(1/n^2)$ on this section. So, without loss of generality, we assume that $\rho(s)\neq 0$ on Γ, and the previous remark implies that

$$\text{supp }(1-\eta_n)=\{\Gamma(s)+r\cos\varphi\overrightarrow{\nu}(s)+r\sin\varphi\overrightarrow{\beta}(s)\mid(s,r,\varphi)\in[0,L]\times[0,2/n]\times[0,2\pi)\}\bigcup_{i=1,2}O_i$$

and the application Ψ: $(s,r,\varphi)\mapsto\Gamma(s)+r\cos\varphi\overrightarrow{\nu}+r\sin\varphi\overrightarrow{\beta}$ is a diffeomorphism invertible where $\psi^{-1}(M)$ gives the parameter of $\Gamma(s)$ where $\mathrm{d}(M,\Gamma)$ is reached, the distance $\mathrm{d}(M,\Gamma)$, and the angle between $\overrightarrow{\Gamma(s)M}$ and $\overrightarrow{\nu}$. In the expression of $\text{supp}\,(1-\eta_n)$, O_i denotes the half ball on each endpoints, which obviously verify $\text{mes}\,O_i=\mathcal{O}(1/n^3)$.

Using the general relation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\overrightarrow{\beta}}{\mathrm{d}s}=\theta(s)\overrightarrow{\nu}(s),\quad \frac{\mathrm{d}\overrightarrow{\nu}}{\mathrm{d}s}=-\rho(s)\overrightarrow{\tau}(s)-\theta(s)\overrightarrow{\beta}(s),$$

where θ is a smooth function called the torsion, then we can compute $D\Psi$ in the orthonormal base $(\overrightarrow{\tau},\overrightarrow{\nu},\overrightarrow{\beta})$:

$$D\Psi(r,s,f)=\begin{pmatrix}1-r\rho\cos\varphi & 0 & 0\\ r\theta\sin\varphi & \cos\varphi & -r\sin\varphi\\ -r\theta\cos\varphi & \sin\varphi & r\cos\varphi\end{pmatrix}$$

which implies that $|\det D\Psi(r,s,f)|\leq r/2$ if r is chosen small enough (i.e. $r\leq 1/(2\rho_M)$). Finally, we can compute for n big enough:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{mes}\Big(\text{supp }(1-\eta_n)\Big) &= \int_{\text{supp }(1-\eta_n)}1\,dxdydz=\int_0^L\int_0^{2/n}\int_0^{2\pi}|\det D\Psi(r,s,f)|\,d\varphi drds+\mathcal{O}(1/n^3)\\ &\leq \int_0^L\int_0^{2/n}\int_0^{2\pi}r/2\,d\varphi drds+\mathcal{O}(1/n^3)=\frac{2\pi L}{n^2}+\mathcal{O}(1/n^3)\end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof of Proposition 3.1.

Acknowledgements. I am partially supported by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche, Project MathOcéan, grant ANR-08-BLAN-0301-01 and by the Project "Instabilities in Hydrodynamics" financed by Paris city hall (program "Emergences") and the Fondation Sciences Mathématiques de Paris.

References

[1] Chemin J-Y., Desjardins B., Gallagher I. and Grenier E., *Mathematical Geophysics: An introduction to rotating fluids and to the Navier-Stokes equations*, Oxford University Press, 2006.

[2] Costabel M., Dauge M. and Duduchava R., Asymptotics without logarithmic terms for crack problems, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 28 (2003), no. 5-6, 869926.

[3] Galdi G. P., *An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations. Steady-state problems. Second edition*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2011.

[4] Gonnord S. and Tosel N, *Calcul différentiel*, Ellipse, 1998.

[5] Iftimie D. and Kelliher J., Remarks on the vanishing obstacle limit for a 3D viscous incompressible fluid, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 137 (2009), no. 2, 685-694.

[6] Iftimie D., Lopes Filho M.C. and Nussenzveig Lopes H.J., Two Dimensional Incompressible Viscous Flow Around a Small Obstacle, *Math. Annalen.* 336 (2006), 449-489.

[7] Lacave C., Two Dimensional Incompressible Viscous Flow Around a Thin Obstacle Tending to a Curve, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, Vol. 139 (2009), No. 6, pp. 1138-1163.

[8] Lacave C., Two Dimensional Incompressible Ideal Flow Around a Small Curve, to appear in *Comm. Partial Differential Equations.*

[9] Temam R., *Navier-Stokes Equations, Theory and Numerical Analysis*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979.

(C. Lacave) Université Paris-Diderot (Paris 7), Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu, UMR 7586 - CNRS, 175 rue du Chevaleret, 75013 Paris, France

E-mail address: `lacave@math.jussieu.fr`